

REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated December 21, 2004.

Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

In order to advance the prosecution of this case, claim 4 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 112 is now moot.

In view of the rejection of claims 1 and 3 on the ground of double patenting with claims 3 and 4 of applicant's '286 patent, claims 1 and 3 have also been canceled.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of remaining original claims 2 and 5-6 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Attached hereto is a Terminal Disclaimer. Accordingly, that rejection is now moot.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 have been written in independent form. Claims 7-9 have been added. Claim 7 corresponds to original claim 5 while claim 8 corresponds to original claim 6. Both of these claims are dependent on claim 2. Claim 9 corresponds to original claim 6 and is dependent on claim 5.

Since the only claims remaining in the application have not been rejected over the prior art or are dependent on those claims this application should be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: Harold Pezzner
Harold Pezzner, Esquire
Reg. No. 22,112
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz, LLP
1007 N. Orange Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 658-9141

@PFDesktop\::ODMA/MHODMA/IMANDMS;CB;382975;1